CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXIV No. 9 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* September 1983

WILL THE KILLING STOP HERE?

by ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE

Under the ministrations of the hyper-hypocrites who purport to rule us, the Law has come to such repute as to make Mr. Bumble's emphatic strictures on it appear not just inadequate but even complimentary. From being — perhaps unjustly in the context — dubbed "a ass" the Law could now with truth be called "an criminal". The result of the latest debate (if such a rehearsed performance warrants the description) — misleadingly called "the hanging debate" — has merely underlined the obvious public confusion concerning the very purpose of legislation. The "hanging" subject having been mulled over, seemingly definitively, through the media, has now sunk into the oblivion attained by other once controversial legislation as, for example, the permissive law on homosexual activity. However, this interment seems to us somewhat premature. The negative outcome of the Parliamentary "free vote" gave rise to questions on alternative solutions that no one has yet answered, and speculation on the inauguration and management of such legislation that no one has yet pursued to any logical conclusion.

"Alternative solutions", for instance: a society that finds it barbaric to administer condign punishment to convicted murderers is unlikely to keep them in *discomfort* for whatever period the liberal conscience will allow them to be incarcerated. So — comfort it must be: comfort possibly greater than that enjoyed by many of the public-at-large who in the last analysis must pay for the accommodation of both the criminals *and* the tender consciences that preserve them from retribution in this world. Peregrine Worsthorne in the *Sunday Telegraph* said the right word on that:

"Pay no attention to the Parliamentarians when they promise to find alternative draconian punishments to take the place of the gallows — longer 'life' sentences, etc. To the modern conscience, permanent incarceration will soon seem as repugnantly barbaric as the gallows, and with the gallows assumed to be permanently out of the way, the next target for emotional assault will be the life sentence, with prison governors coming forward to testify on television to its barbarous consequences. Prisons are hell, and will be seen to be so once the TV cameras are allowed — as is already happening — to document the full extent of the horror. Abolishing capital punishment is not the end of the road for those who flinch at draconian punishment. Appetite for penal reform will grow with eating, and it is only a matter of time before the keepers of the nation's conscience tell us that, because there is no evidence that life sentences deter, these barbaric remnants must also be removed from the statute book, in the name of progress."

That kind of progress, he then says, can lead only to rule by criminals rather than the State in the matter of dealing out death. "But of course," he concludes, "long before that point is reached, public opinion will have insisted on restoring the rope . . ." And there this otherwise excellent article leaves the matter "hanging", so to speak. When "public opinion" *is* able to *insist* on the passing of some necessary patriotic legislation to restore probity to our poor, misgoverned country, *Candour's* occupation will be gone but it apears that we shall be ungainfully employed a while yet.

Penal Pampering For I.R.A. Murderers

Only a few weeks after the rejection of legal capital punishment for illegal capital murder, the public was informed that it was to have the pleasure of maintaining a motley collection of convicted I.R.A. traitorous murderers and/or arms-carriers and bomb-makers for an estimated agglomerate period of four thousand years! The monetary cost of this piece of liberality will be in the realm of millions of pounds extorted from the tax-payers, but there was no mention of that from the advocates of reductions in public spending nor yet from the clamourers for the allocation of extra revenue for the maintenance of the National Health Service. Commentators, correspondents, Churchmen and humanists also found it unnecessary to say anything on the subject, even when one convicted conspirator whose sentence was suspended because, in the Judge's words, "what mother would not have done the same?", showed contemptuous unrepentence in her partisanship for the criminals whose conspiratorial meetings had been held in her own house. It will be interesting to see if compensation to those bereaved of breadwinners rivals the sums lavished on their enemies' welfare.

So much for respect for the law in Northern Ireland. In the rest of the United Kingdom there is the added complication of the preponderance of "ethnic" minorities" in the prison populations. The publication of "identikit" likenesses and the evidence of security television monitors make it increasingly difficult to conceal the frequency of coloured involvement in crimes of violence. The calls for positive discrimination in other spheres make it unlikely in the extreme that the same will not be demanded in the realm of violent crime. Indeed, already some psychiatrist has said, speaking of Rastafarian thugs, "what is playful in one culture may appear pathological in ours." Judges have reduced or remitted sentences on the grounds that the offender was "only following customs obtaining in his country of origin." No amount of "bringing back the death penalty" could overcome such positive discrimination as that.

One last category regrettably well-represented in the Mother of Parliaments who could be relied upon to campaign vigorously against anything so barbaric as judicial killing is the gang of "civilised" abortionists, accessories before and after the fact of the murder of more than two million babies since that infamous Bill was passed. These might be said to have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo!

With this array of stalwarts in the arena, it must soon have been plain to parliamentarians that the "abolitionists" stood in no danger of defeat in their domain. Yet prior to the crucial vote the pressure in the media was unremitting, and a wager on a significant negative would have earned long odds. So it was the majority of the public, as usual, who were to be gulled into thinking they had a real chance of victory. That made the result all the more astounding and the margin of defeat all the more devastating. After two or three days devoted to "rubbing it in" the media silence descended as it does over all yesterday's news. It will be a long time before the people will have heart or hope to try again.

Planned That Way

The whole operation bore all the hallmarks of those devious masters who "plan things that way" so that most of us never see where we are going until we are neck deep in the morass. What at first appears a lot of liberal mush concerned only with the "human rights" of deviants and the consciences of legislators, is seen — in the afterglow — as a succession of deliberate steps designed to make the law of the land so little worthy of respect that our country becomes a place where some of the people abide by all the laws some of the time; others disregard some of the laws all the time; and yet others break what laws they will since the punishment will never fit the crime.

This latest debacle, if that is how we view it, is only one frame in the scenario of disaster. This particular footage began with the Act to *allow* "consenting adults in private" to perform with legal impunity "sins crying out to Heaven for vengeance" that enabled a bob-tail of perverts to emerge in high places. Palaces of both royal and political variety proved environments particularly conducive to their propagation. The legalising of the practice in private of unnatural vice predictably led to prosyletising the cult in public, so confusing and blunting "public opinion" that the ruin of families and the debauching of children progresses unnoticed except by the most determinedly articulate of un-liberal Christian patriots. The time was soon ripe for the legalisation of yet another sin that cries to Heaven — murder. The Abortion Acts *allow* the impunable killing of babies in the womb. Abortifacient contraceptives accounted for possibly millions more. So-called "sex education" provided by the State prepares the minds of children to accept that horror as beneficial, and to abuse their young bodies with illicit sex, risking venereal diseases whilst frustrating the "right, true end of loving."

No compulsion in these laws, you notice. The devil knows when to rely on concupiscence to gain his ends.

Compulsion came with the law enforcing the wearing of crash helmets by motor-cyclists. Again the ground was cut from under the protesters on the principle of "good-doing". "Why object to what can do no harm and might do untold good?" The generality of objection subsided. Who wanted to be branded an uncaring introvert? Then an ethnic minority sect defied that law on religious grounds and were declared exempt. The Sikhs had driven a coach-and-motorcycles through the law! But, "oh well, it won't affect us," was the tacit response of the rest of the population.

A few weeks ago, the current situation was admirably summed up by Stella Hughes in an article carried in July's *Spearhead* titled "Behind Those Belts." Such autocratic legislation usurps people's power of decision and, thus, she says: "If people are not allowed to think for themselves they will cease to do so." How right she was! Despite all the grumbling and defiance that had gone before, no sooner was the compulsive law passed with a maximum fine of £50 for evasion incorporated, than possibly 99 per cent of drivers and front-seat passengers not only complied, but agreed that it was a "good thing". The law is now both asinine and criminal: the people subject to it can no longer distinguish between right and wrong, and docilely concede that "Big Brother knows best", which is surely what Big Brother intended all along.

The killing has not finished with the innocents yet. When our turn comes it will be too late to need a judicial death penalty. If we wish to save our very country from voluntary enthanasia, we must save ourselves from complicity in the crimes that are *allowed* in our name.

CUT AND THRUST

by HUGH McNEILE

MAGGIE'S SONS OF ENGLAND — It cannot have escaped anybody's notice that two of the three most prominent Cabinet posts in the new Government have been awarded by Mrs. Thatcher to Jews. Marcia Falkender took a different view in *The Mail on Sunday*, however, in seeking to persuade her readers that now we have a "Latvian" as Chancellor and a "Lithuanian" as Home Secretary. "Eastern Europe," she crowed, "this is your finest hour." The *Jewish Chronicle's* press critic, Philip Kleinman, gave Lady Forkbender's coyness short shrift in saying that he was tossing up in his mind whether her remark was "snide or merely witless." Hardly snide, surely, for the female eminence who abetted Lord Wilson of Scouse in showering honours on the coterie of Jewish businessmen who clustered around the former Labour leader during his latter years in office. As her mentor once proclaimed the whole world his kin, it would astound me if Madame Marcia is in any way adverse to a couple of the highest offices of state being occupied by gentlemen whose forbears hailed far from our English shires.

Messrs. Lawson and Brittan, in the eyes of the ever-boastful *J.C.*, "typify the breed of 'meritocrats' with whom Mrs. Thatcher likes to surround herself." Neither of these worthy new sons of England wasted any time in putting a distinctive stamp on their offices of State, Lawson promising to savage N.H.S. spending and Brittan delivering a homily on the failings of the British people in their attitude to coloured immigrants. The latter was reported in *The Times* on July 23rd, when our far from laconic "Lithuanian" announced at the Hindu Cultural Centre in Bradford that he was *"unshakably* opposed to discrimination on any grounds." What's new? So was his predecessor: imposing his Black-law was the only matter on which Willie *didn't* wobble!

The Government, according to the Brain of Brittan, has an important role to play in changing attitudes on race. There is incontrovertible research evidence (whose, he didn't specify) to back up individual experience of discrimination in recruitment and selection. "We know what the problems are," he confided, "and if we are honest we will admit that their root cause lies deep in our own fears and prejudices." Can it be that Mr Brittan (née Brittanaski) has forgotten how the country that he now finds so deplorably lacking in tolerance extended haven and hospitality to his family when they emigrated from Lithuania in 1927? How infernally impertinent that he should now imply that the solution of the race problem lies in our own minds.

PARLIAMENTARY PRESUMPTION — The bare-faced clamour by Tory back-benchers and almost all the Parliamentary Labour Party for the 31 per cent pay increase, recommended by the Top Salaries Review Body, to be paid in full revealed the sheer cynicism and humbug of many of our legislators. Such was their arrogance that none thought it worthwhile, during their debate on the matter, to explain satisfactorily how insulating *them* from the impact of inflation would alleviate *our* national plight, for which, no-one needs reminding, they are primarily to blame. Last winter, the Tory backwoods element were swift to urge poorly-paid health workers to accept an award of 4.5 per cent.

M.P.s are fond of pontificating to strikers that they knew the pay and conditions before they applied for their jobs and so should display considerably more contentment and gratitude for their lot. Should not such logic apply to the Honourable (and not so Honourable) Members, too? The insistence that the quality of Parliament is necessarily diminished by the alleged inadequacy of financial reward really has no evidence to sustain it. The heavy applications for Parliamentary candidacies in the couple of years before the last election would suggest there is no shortage of hopefuls willing to take the place of any M.P.s who find the remuneration beneath consideration. As for the argument that there is something deleterious about politicians being forced to look for work outside the House, I am inclined to agree with Jock Bruce-Gardyne's judgement that the nation suffers from full-time legislators, anyway. They pass far more laws than are good for us.

The 650 chatterers and sycophants who inhabit the Palace of Westminster are not alone in their willingness to benefit from whatever pickings are to be had. My eye hit upon a report in *The Times* on June 28th that, after a meeting with Mrs. Thatcher, the President of the C.B.I. announced: "We are getting pay increases down, but the Prime Minister and we are agreed that they are not coming down fast enough." This same captain of industry, a correspondent later revealed, accepted a 28 per cent increase in his emoluments as chairman of Scottish Television last year and 21 per cent for his chairmanship of Dunlop — awards that were way above those agreed to by the employees of the two companies. Little imagination is required to see the effect of such, shall I say (in deference to the laws of libel), inconsistency on the minds of the trade unionists, the bulk of whom are all too anxious to shove their snouts in the wages trough, as Sid Weighall once so colourfully, and accurately, put it. Are we not entitled to expect that those in a position to do so in Parliament and industry should exercise leadership by example? Or have the old notions of service and duty completely rotted?

BUZBY'S ASSET STRIP — The continuing privatisation programme, which was trailed significantly in the Tory election manifesto, is set to dispose of British Telecom and, possibly after that, the Post Office. The Government seems to want it both ways. When public corporations are in deficit (usually through burdensome interest repayments), they are portrayed as parasites living off the taxpayer. When they are profitable, they are sold off. Unions and management might be forgiven for taking the view there is almost an in-built incentive to be inefficient! Of course, the ideological attractions of such a sale are obvious to a Government that genuflects before the golden image of *laissez-faire* capitalism, but undoubtedly the main incentive is financial.

Disposing of British Telecom is likely to bring three to four billion pounds into the Exchequer from which future public sector borrowing requirements will be met. Rapacious speculators and businessmen, who can be expected to snap up the bulk of the shares on offer (contrary to Mr. Lawson's propaganda, less exalted switchboard girls and telephone engineers will partake of mere morsels), are slobbering at the mouth at the prospect of their likely profits, for with the explosion of communications opportunities British Telecom should yield a potential pot of gold for investors. Amid the arguments surrounding the "sale of the century", however, one point has been curiously omitted: the infamy of placing in the "hand of new, unhappy lords" an industry that is so essential a part of our security and defence. To Mrs. Thatcher, we must conclude, the fast buck weighs more heavily than any consideration of longer-term national security. Her Government might claim to be ruled by profit in its actions, but treachery is the only description that fits this wilful disposal of such a vital national asset.

DISCIPLES OF REVOLUTION — The Leftish partisanship of the World Council of Churches knows no bounds. For years it has operated a murderously cruel policy of supplying funds to Marxist African guerillas, who held high carnival torturing and slaughtering scores of priests and nuns. In a twisted, masochistic sense, perhaps the wicked clerics who bestow W.C.C. largesse regard their unfortunate brethren as like early Christians, being fed to the lions. Now the World Council is under fire for its persistent silence on the plight of persecuted Christians behind the Iron Curtain. A group called Christian Solidarity International pulled a master-stroke in booking the same Vancouver venue, and at the same time, as the W.C.C.'s Assembly. In addition to holding their own counter-assembly as the persecuted Church, C.S.I. made themselves conspicuous at W.C.C. events, all to the disquiet of the latter's many Left-wing delegates.

The failure to emit more than a whisper of criticism, as far as press reports go, about Russia or any other atheistic Communist state, while uttering fierce denunciations of "U.S. imperialism" in Central America and "racism" in South Africa, was attributed by Dr. Robert Runcie (who acted like a circus ring-master at several of the W.C.C.'s parades of clowns that masqueraded as religious services) to "the desire to have the rare opportunity of meeting the East European churchmen and recognising the difficulties in getting them to the Assembly." Well, typical of the "churchmen" whom the Archschismatic of Canterbury would have us believe find it so troublesome to travel outside the Iron Curtain are priests of the Russian Orthodox Church, whose Patriarch and hierarchy have consented to work hand-in-glove with their country's Communist masters. Does Dr. Runcie seriously imagine the odd discreet word in their ears about the oppression endured by less compromising believers in, say, the Baltic states or the Ukraine is going to have the slightest effect?

LA TRAHISON DES CLERICS — A more accurate explanation of the World Council of Churches' abstention from criticism of Soviet persecution is that it is a body dominated by what Hamish Fraser calls "the hypocritical proponents of *anti*-anti-Communism." Whether through naivety or intent, this progressive church clique, fired by the poisonous "theology of liberation", ignores the intrinsic evil of Communism, but exaggerates and denounces whatever measures, however licit, are taken by anti-Communist governments in fighting for national survival. In his pamphlet, *Communism: The Reality*, Mr. Fraser, while directing his comments at the Roman Catholic Church, accounts for the incredible paradox thus:

"The 'Socialist take-over from the Christian religion' that has given Moscow an unprecedented accession of strength outside its frontiers derives from the paradoxical fact that hordes of 'progressive' Catholic intellectuals, clerical and lay, found Revolutionary Marxism to be the last word in socio-political wisdom just when it had been completely discredited, not only behind the Iron Curtain, but also in the mind of anyone who had any experience of it, and in a world already littered with tens of millions of disillusioned Communists. Which clerical idiocy is epitomised by the French 1983 Missal which commemorates the centenary of the death of Karl Marx out of appreciation of the contribution to 'Human Sciences' made by Marxist socio-economic analysis. Moscow's new accession of strength derives from the fact that today its errors are being spread, and its aggression facilitated, not merely by *apparatchiks* and an assortment of fellow travellers, including lunatic fringe clerics with little or no influence, but also by Catholic Episcopal Commissions and a host of prominent Catholic Churchmen . . . And the basic cause of this treason is the fact that, in the wake of Vatican II, Catholic Neomodernist theologians have so 'demythologised' the Christian faith, transporting it into the key of naturalism, that their disciples now think almost exclusively in terms of an earthly rather than a heavenly paradise. And since only Socialism nurtures the dream of an earthly paradise they have nowhere else to turn. Short of reconversion, therefore, such folk cannot but constitute an invaluable 'fifth column' for the revolution throughout the free world'."

Wholeheartedly do I agree. And hasn't history had the last laugh, as Hamish Fraser suggested somewhere else, in that whereas Marx said religion was the opium of the people, it is Marxism which is proving to be the opium of the entire progressive Christian intelligentsia?

HEMP UNKEMPT

In blood that's cold, thou shalt not kill;
Not quite God's, but Runcie's will!
The Rippers who make murder sport
Must not be hanged when they are caught;
The terror bomb, remote controlled,
Must not be rated "Murder, cold"
And thus the coward anarchist
Is chastised with the pulpy fist.
The burglar who resorts to gun
Rather than the risk to run
Of punishment for minor crime
Takes policeman's life in lieu of "time":
The blood runs hot in such affrays
But for the corpse, unarmed it lays
Symbolic of the sanctity
For life that's all barbarity.
According to the Archbishop
Who'll hang before he'll have "the drop".
Suffer little children who
Are dured unto a sexual zoo
By animals which uncontent,
Despoiling wholly innocent,
Then finalise their rottenness
And kill, safe from the rope's caress.
O Canterbury's bells do ring
Hey nonny no, and ding dong ding
The atom-bomb, in all conscience,
Albeit dreadful, is defence,
Deterrent too, we can but hope,
So why so shy to stretch the rope?

B. E. BIGGS.

LAWSON'S LAW

"[Nigel Lawson] was this paper's first City Editor and his style, not dissimilar to his political style, was direct, witty, irreverent and penetrating. He not only invented a new form of City journalism but whole new rules, too. There was, for instance, Lawson's Law that the profits of a company were in inverse ratio to the height of the chairman.

"He noticed that the great men of the day — Charles Clore, Isaac Wolfson, Jules Thorn, Jack Cohen and others — were all about five feet nothing, yet their profits increased by leaps and bounds . . ."

— *Sunday Telegraph, June 12th.*

UNENDED BATTLE (Part VII) by HUGH McNEILE

A PLAN FOR THE BRITISH FUTURE

by HUGH McNEILE

A criticism occasionally directed at the League of Empire Loyalists was that it offered little in the way of constructive solutions to what was wrong in the world. Of course, every movement whose role is to warn of danger begins in such a manner; only when it feels it has sufficiently alterted the public does it develop positive counter-policies. A. K. Chesterton often drew an analogy with a house on fire, arguing that its occupants would not normally bother themselves about the rebuilding or refurnishing until the flames had been extinguished. In 1961, however, he wrote a booklet entitled *Tomorrow: A plan For The British Future*, in which he set out the policies necessary for British world survival.

The first priority was to opt out of all internationalist agencies and treaties that infringed British sovereignty, such as the United Nations, UNESCO, the International Monetary Fund and NATO. In their place, A.K. advocated the forging of a series of alliances between Britain and her allies which "nether sapped national spirit nor denied to nations their own sovereign power of decision." That done, the British Commonwelth as currently constituted should be abandoned for it no longer possessed the intimate nature of an association of nations of predominantly British stock, as had been the case before the granting of independence to colonial territories. Obviously bearing in mind the recent Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, at which South Africa withdrew from membership, A.K. asserted that the actions of the new African and Asian members made this "nebulous conglomeration of peoples, united by no common allegiance, an active agent in the dissolution of the British world system."

In place of a liquidated Commonwealth, *Tomorrow* envisaged a union of the White Dominions. The system would include Australia, New Zealand and Canada, with an "honoured place" reserved for both South Africa and Eire since they shared with Britain "a heritage which finds expressions in innumerable departments of life." Strategically and economically, such a world system would "command the future". If necessary, a re-conquest of Kenya and the Rhodesias would have to be undertaken to prevent them being returned to the barbarism that majority-rule threatened to bring. The adherence of some independent ex-colonies would be considered, but only on terms strictly laid down. There were strong influences at work, *Tomorrow* conceded, that had pulled the Dominions away from the British orbit, but this scheme for reviving their former unity was seen as very much easier to achieve than any of the "innumerable schemes for securing the federation of nations which do not and never have accepted a common allegiance or shared the same institutions."

One factor prising apart the nations of British stock was the drive on the part of the Macmillan Government in the early 1960s to ensnare Britain in the European Economic Community, for its effect was to force producers in Canada, Australia and New Zealand to look for new trading orbits in the United States and Asia. Membership of the Common Market was objected to on a host of other grounds — it would lead to increased industrial mergers, unlimited foreign immigration and a lower standard of living — and the prospect of signing the Treaty of Rome became as much of an anathema to the League as the world government racket had been in the mid-'fifties. The most fundamental objection was the matter of sovereignty. The Treaty of Rome, in welding the E.E.C. states together, threatened the essential attribute of nationhood by providing for the free movement of goods, capital and labour across national fronties and the right of an unelected body of foreign bureaucrats to make decisions binding upon national governments. In the long term, it was clear that what was being worked for was a European federation. To those internationalists who objected that he was swimming against the currents of modern history, A.K. responded that their cherished vision of a supra-national Western Europe would be essentially a contrivance, Where peoples of disparate traditions and sentiments were placed together, such a union could "only be maintained much of the time by force."

The Jeffery Inheritance

The *Candour*-League movement faced a sudden grave crisis in the middle of 1961 with the death of its principal benefactor, Robert Jeffery. Apart from Jeffery, who had given A.K. some £70,000 since 1953 to underwrite *Candour* and the L.E.L., most other financial donations had, in comparison, been small, representing the genuine sacrifices of ordinary people. George Drummond, the millionaire banker and head of Drummond's Branch of the Bank of Scotland, was a League sympathiser until his death

in 1963, but as his obituary notice in *Candour* dryly observed, he had been considerably more generous with his moral suport than with his financial suport! So, deprived of Jeffery's donations, the League's existence as a fighting organisation was clearly at risk.

Jeffery's cheques always tended to arrive at infrequent and irregular intervals, thus causing A.K. some financial anxiety over the years. However, in the winter of 1958 he was informed by Jeffery that he had been named as the sole heir to the millionaire's entire estate. The will was sealed and lodged for safe keeping with the Trustee Department of the Bank of Chile and a copy was sent to A.K. It had been his rule to post audited accounts to Jeffery every March, which were always acknowledged. But in 1961 no answer came. When, by July, a second set of accounts were sent and left unacknowledged, Aidan Mackey was despatched to Chile to ascertain what was wrong. He discovered that Jeffery had died in April. Ominously, fifteen hours before his death a new open will had been made, naming an illegitimate daughter as sole heir. This had been written and read *to* Jeffery who, it appears, did no more than mutter a vague "yes" and allow his thumb-print to be attached to the document.

Justifiably, A.K. was highly suspicious of this new will. Jeffery had been in a highly drugged state prior to his death owing to the severe illness from which he was suffering. It was well nigh inconceivable that he had voluntarily made another will, particularly since he had often expressed to A.K. the great pride he felt for the League's work. Surely such a long, cordial and, above all, trusting relationship would not have been abruptly terminated without some prior intimation? Solicitors in Santiago were engaged to contest the open will, but before they could obtain the sealed will in A.K.'s favour that had been lodged at the Bank of Chile, it was extracted by Jeffery's lawyer on his (Jeffery's) illegitimate daughter's instructions and handed to her. Her husband then conveniently "lost" it. As sealed wills in Chile must be opened by a court of law, A.K.'s solicitors had everybody concerned arrested on a charge of conspiracy to steal a will. Unfortunately, the court found there was insufficient evidence of the deliberate destruction of the original will, and this decision was later upheld by an appeal court.

So far, legal costs amounted to several thousands of pounds and at the end of March 1962 *Candour's* scant resources had been so depleted that it was necessary temporarily to close down publication. A further action followed, alleging falsification of the new will, but this failed too, and Jeffery's assets were unfrozen. A.K. later sued the Bank of Chile for compensation for illegally disposing of the old will by releasing it to Jeffery's lawyer. Although the court found in his favour, the Bank at once appealed, with the decision being reversed. That was in 1971 and by then all the legal avenues open for redress had been exhausted. The Jeffery inheritance was irretrievably lost.

Hard Core Loyalists

The loss of a weekly *Candour* (a bi-monthly *Candour Interim Report* replaced it until publication was resumed on a monthly basis in May 1965) had inevitable repercussions on the League's efficiency as an organisation, for A. K. Chesterton complained that the lack of "the weekly stimulus of attacks on the International Money Power" led to a loss of activists. However, a hard core of Loyalists remained who appeared at various C.N.D. and M.C.F. meetings during 1962 and 1963, as well as rallies addressed by Conservative politicians. When the Aldermaston marchers reached Hyde Park on the Easter weekend of 1963, for instance, young Avril Walters dumped an eight pound bag of flour over the head of Canon Collins.

The General Election of October 1964 gave the League a new lease of life, with three Independent Loyalist candidates being sponsored. Austen Brooks stood at Streatham against Colonial Secretary Duncan "Shifting" Sandys, Rosine de Bounevialle at Petersfield and Leslie Greene at East Fife. There had been plans to nominate another three, including Avril Walters at North Lewisham, but they were hampered by a lack of funds. The votes polled by Leslie, Rosine and Austen were modest, for in 1964 as in the General Election this year, the political climate was not one in which selfless appeals to work for the restoration of British national pride were likely to fall on many receptive ears. However, if large votes from the electorate were lacking, the election campaign had one benefit in that A.K. found "far more numerous sections" of the membership were willing to make "far more contributions" than ever before. With all available help concentrated on addressing envelopes and canvassing, there was little time to secure publicity by heckling at opponents' meetings. But in Hampshire Rosine found a tremendous amount of press attention focussed on her campaign as the constituency was served by six evening and weekly newspapers. Also, media interest was excited by what was called a "petticoat election" as three of the four candidates were women.

Read Deirdre Manifold's startling and best-selling book, FATIMA AND THE GREAT CONSPIRACY. Only £3 from Candour Publishing Co.

THRILLS AND REALITIES

The publishing house of J. M. Dent and Sons is to be congratulated for re-issuing in a stylishly-presented "Classic Thrillers" series some of the best adventure tales that came from the pens of John Buchan, Sapper and Dornford Yates. Period pieces Yates' *Blind Corner* or Sapper's *The Black Gang* certainly are, but such writers spun their yarns to a high quality of plot and charm in what was an unsurpassed era of adventure writing. Some critics, however, have shown a ready inclination in recent years to castigate the likes of Sapper for the heinous offence of anti-semitism. The jibe, according to a *Times* reviewer, appears in Julian Symons' introduction to one of the Dent paperbacks — an Edgar Wallace novel — when the remark is made that Wallace showed none of the anti-semitism that "mars" Sapper and Buchan.

In his time, Mr. Symons has written an agreeable array of history books, as well as a long list of crime thrillers. I wonder, though, how thoroughly versed he can be in the driving force behind subversion and revolution to dub Sapper and Buchan in such a way. For it is surely inconceivable that any intelligent person who is thus cognisant would deride the creator of Bulldog Drummond for his discerning commentaries on the physiognomies of Bolshevik agitators! Again, what is there to quarrel with in Scudder's prophetic warning to Richard Hannay in 1914 of a world revolutionary force of "educated anarchists" and Jewish financiers conspiring to "set Europe by the ears"? Three years later, with financial backing from Kuhn, Loeb & Co. of Wall Street, Lenin and Trotsky's knives were implanted in the Empire of the Tsar. Scudder's cautionary tale, evidently, had in it a lot that was germane to the contemporary world situation Indeed, Churchill's authoritative testimony in the *Illustrated Sunday Herald* in 1920 gave the lie to the notion that "the hidden hand" existed solely in the realm of fiction.

John Buchan and particularly Sapper undeniably expressed strong attitudes towards subversion that have lost acceptance in many quarters today, but the implication that they were motivated by some kind of irrational antipathy towards Jews is sheer nonsense. Novels such as *The Thirty-Nine Steps* and *The Black Gang*, although fiction, revealed with perspicuity some of the secret influences that have bedevilled this disastrous age, and so I set great store by them. They are also, as another critic enthused, "rattling good yarns".

HUGH McNEILE.

DEADLIER THAN TYPHOID

Under the heading "Safari wife tells of killing," an article in the *Daily Express* on June 18th recounted how a bus-load of British tourists were fired on by bandits outside the Kenyan capital of Nairobi. What was particularly informative in the piece was a statement by Mrs. Audrey Smith, whose husband was shot and killed in the attack. She said, "What is very wrong about it all is that this sort of thing is not uncommon in Kenya. Yet who knows that? *We* did not know. The Kenyan authorities don't warn people; our holiday company didn't warn us." Claims by politicians and the media that Kenya is a fine example of success on the part of a newly-emergent, "independent African state would seem to have a very hollow ring".

R. D. MOLESWORTH.

ECU-MENU-CAL DISPUTE

"The American youth delegation [at the World Council of Churches Assembly] suggested a day of fasting as a show of solidarity with the world's hungry. Their Third World counterparts rejected this idea, reluctant to pass up the chance of such excellent food all paid for in advance."

— *Sunday Telegraph,* Augst 7th.

For sale: Rightist books from 1963 onwards. Pre-war detective books and westerns. S.A.E. to Mrs. Magoveny, 16 Matilda Gardens, Belfast 12.

Read
SPEARHEAD
Edited by John Tyndall
Send 53p for a sample copy to:
Seacroft, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, East Sussex

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Subscribe Today !

U.K.	£4.00
Overseas airmail	£4.50
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.

53, Greencroft Towers,
Felling, Gateshead 10.